



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,856	07/22/2003	Matthew Richard McAlonis	17938 (AT 20958-02091)	6541

7590 03/08/2006

Robert Kapalka  
Tyco Electronics Corporation  
Suite 140  
4550 New Linden Hill Road  
Wilmington, DE 19808

EXAMINER

VU, HIEN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,856

Applicant(s)

MCALONIS ET AL.

Examiner

Hien D. Vu

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,11-17 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8,10,18 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,11-13,15-17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features " the first and second base portions to be joined to a common conductive path on a circuit board" in claims 2, 12 must be shown in the elected species 1, Figs. 1 and 6 or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2833

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

3. (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2,5-7,9, 11,12,16,17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnescu (702).

The disclosure of Johnescu provides a complete response to each and every element set forth in the claims. For example, Figs.18-29 show a housing 301, first and second contact elements 303 each having a base portion 329 spaced apart from one another and first and second beams 323 projecting toward one another in an overlapping pattern.

As to claim 2, insofar as the claim can be understood, Johnescu shows the first and second base portions being configured for joining to a common conductive path T on a circuit board S1.

As to claim 5, Johnescu shows first and second base portions are positioned proximate ends of the contact along a longitudinal axis of the contact.

As to claim 6, Johnescu shows the first and the second base portions are formed separate from one another.

As to claim 7, Johnescu shows the first and second contact beams are oriented along first and second paths that aligned in the vertical planes.

As to claim 9, Johnescu shows the base portions having prongs (not labeled) and solder paddles 305.

Art Unit: 2833

As to claims 11,12,15-17 and 19, the claims have substantially similar features as claims 1-2,5-7 and 9; therefore, they are rejected under the similar rationale.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnescu in view of Suzuki.

Johnescu does not show the first contact beam having at least a pair of beams formed in a common base portion. Suzuki, Figs. 5-6 show a contact beam 20 having at least a pair of contact beams 21 formed in a common base 24. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Johnescu by forming a pair of the first contact beams on the same side with a common base, as taught by Suzuki, in order to provide cost saving and faster installation.

7. Claims 4 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,9,11-17 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D. Vu at telephone number 571-272-2016.

Application/Control Number: 10/624,856

Page 5

Art Unit: 2833

HV

3/4/06



HIENVU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER